UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/785,230	02/20/2001	Mamiko Kuramochi	1046.1242 (JDH)	4371

21171	7590	04/11/2006

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER
WONG, LESLIE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2164	

DATE MAILED: 04/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>27 December 2005</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-38</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-38</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>20 February 2001</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   Receipt of Applicant's Amendment, filed 27 December 2005, is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1-22 and 24-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Bence, Jr. et al. (Bence, Jr." 6, 484, I 78) in view of Estrada et al.

("Estrada" 6, 594,664).

As per claim 1, Bence, Jr. discloses a data processing system comprising:

a display control unit of implementing a display module for displaying at least one

format file containing a fixed format, and at least one data file containing item data to be

set to the fixed format (Bence, Jr., col. 4, lines 7-13 and Fig. 5);

a setting unit for setting the item data of the data file to the fixed format of the

format file in accordance with the specifying operation (Bence, Jr., col. 1, line 60 - col. 2,

lines 8, aligning the data contained in a given record, thus, creating a format

corresponding to the client's data format. . .this function serves to mass convert the

client's data records into a common data format")

Bence teaches facilitating the conversion data files into the common format by

prompting the operator to identify a client whose data is to be analyzed and formatted,

and optionally, to enter a specific name of a file containing the data by means of a drop-

down selection function as is well know in the art (col. 3, lines 60-67; col. 4, lines 7-13).

Bence does not explicitly teach firstly selects the data file and second drags the

selected data file to the format file.

Estrada, however, teaches "a specifying control unit implementing a specifying

module which performs two different operations, a first operation in which the specifying

module firstly selects the data file and second drags the selected data file to the format

file, and secondly drags the selected format file to the data file" as the drag and drop is

a specifying operation that instructs the system to convert a data file to a fix format

file/HTML file (col. 20, lines 46-67 and Fig. 16, element 244).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because Estrada's

teaching would have allowed Bence's to provide speed and ease of use for the

operation because it processes two commands (i.e., select and drag-and-drop) in one

action as suggested by Estrada (col. 20, line 57).

As per claim 2, Bence, Jr. and Estrada teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, and further disclose said setting unit sets the item data to the fixed format of the format file, and creates the plurality of files at one time (Bence, Jr. col. 2, lines 18-33).

As per claim 3, Bence, Jr. and Estrada teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, and further disclose said setting unit sets the item data of the data file to the fixed format of the format file by a form overlay function in accordance with the specifying operation (Bence, Jr. Fig. 1, 5, 7, col. 2, lines 18-33).

As per claim 4, Bence, Jr. and Estrada teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, and further disclose a distinguishing unit of distinguishing between file formats of the specified format tile and data file (Bence, Jr., Fig. 1, col. 2, lines 18-33).

As per claim 5, Bence, Jr. and Estrada teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 4, and further disclose distinguishing unit distinguishes between the file formats of the format file and the data file on the basis of any one category of element among extensions, filenames and a file selection order (Bence, Figs. 4, 6A, 7, col. 7, line 65 - col. 8, line 15).

As per claim 6, Bence, Jr. and Estrada teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, and further disclose a print control unit of implementing a print module for printing contents of the item data of the data file which have been set to the fixed format of the format file in accordance with the specifying operation (Bence, Jr., Fig. 4, Printer Maker/Model).

As per claim 7, Bence, Jr. and Estrada teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, and further disclose said specifying control unit implements the specifying module for specifying the format file and the data file by a drag and drop function (Estrada, Fig. 16, element 244).

As per claim 8, Bence, Jr. and Estrada teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, and further disclose said setting unit sets the item data of the data file to the fixed format of the format file in accordance with the specifying operation of specifying the format file and the data file that are displayed in the form of display objects (Bence, Jr., Fig. 1, col. 2, lines 17-42).

Claims 9-12 and 16-19 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claims 1-4.

Claims 13- 15 and 20-22 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claims 6-8.

As per claim 24, Bence, Jr. and Estrada teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 2, and further teach said setting unit sets the item data of the data file to the fixed format of the format file by a form overlay function in accordance with the specifying operation (Bence, Jr., Fig. 1, 5, 7, col. 2, lines 18-49).

As per claim 25, Bence, Jr. and Estrada teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 2, and further teach distinguishing unit distinguishing between file formats of the specified format file and data file (Bence, Jr., col. 2, lines 18-49).

As per claim 26, Bence, Jr. and Estrada teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 2, and further teach a print control unit implementing a print module printing contents of the item data of the data file which have been set to the fixed format of the format file in accordance with the specifying operation (Bence, Jr., col. 6, lines 58-60).

Claim; 27, 32 and 37 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claim 7.

As per claim 28, Bence, Jr. and Estrada teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 2, and further teach said setting unit sets the item data of the data file to the fixed format of the format file in accordance with the specifying operation of

specifying the format file and the data file that are displayed in the form of display

objects (Bence, Jr., col. 1, line 44 - col. 2, line 49).

Claims 29 and 34 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given

above for claim 24.

Claims 30 and 35 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given

above for claim 25.

Claims 31 and 36 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given

above for claim 26.

Claims 33 and 38 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given

above for claim 28.

4.   Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bence,

Jr. et al.('Bence, Jr. 6,484,178) in view of Estrada et al. (Estrada 6,594,664) and further

in view of Yuichi (JP 9282209).

As per claim 23, Bence, Jr. and Estrada teach all the claimed subject matters as

discussed in claim 1, except for explicitly disclosing the format file and the data file are

displayed as a list.

Yuichi, however, teaches displaying the files as a list (Yuichi, p 13, [Solving

Means]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because Yuichi's

teaching would have allowed Bence- Estrada's to enable the user to locate the desired

file quickly and easily by display the files as a list.

Response to Argument

5.   Applicant's arguments filed 27 December 2005have been fully considered but

they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that neither Bence, Jr. et al. nor Estrada et al. teaches or

suggests the features of independent claims 1, 9, and 16. Rather, at best, the

combination of Bence, Jr. et al. nor Estrada et al. teaches or suggests only single

operation specifying.

In response to the preceding arguments, Examiner respectfully submits that

Wikipedia defines the term drag-and drop as **clicking** on a virtual object and **dragging**

it to a different location. It is submitted that the act of "clicking" is equivalent with the

claimed limitation "selecting" (i.e., first operation) and the drag-and-drop operation to

move the object is the second operation. Therefore, Estrada's drag-and-drop operation

includes the selecting step within the drag-and-drop operation, and thus teaches the

claimed limitations "firstly selecting the data file" and "secondly drags the selected data

file..."

Answers.com – Wikipedia states

drag-and-drop

In <u>computer</u> <u>graphical user interfaces</u>, **drag-and-drop** is the action of (or
support for the action of) <u>clicking</u> on a virtual object and dragging it to a

different location or onto another virtual object. In general, it can be used to
invoke many kinds of actions, or create various types of associations
between two abstract objects.

Hence, based on the above, Bence, Jr. et al. and Estrada et al. teach the

limitations as claimed.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Leslie Wong whose telephone number is (571) 272-

4120. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 9:30am - 6:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, CHARLES RONES can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Leslie Wong
Primary Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2164

LW
April 1, 2006